

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the above-captioned patent application. Claims 1, 10, 16 and 19 are independent claims.

The examiner uses Hasegawa to reject claims 1-20 as having been anticipated.

Claims 1, 10, 16 and 19, as amended, recite "cause an executing instruction stream to branch to an instruction at an address specified in the instruction if a state of a specified specified state name is a specified value," or similar language. Hasegawa neither describes nor suggests this quoted feature.

Hasegawa fails describe, suggest, or even mention, state and/or specified state name. Hasegawa discloses a branch instruction format that includes a region for storing 21, a region for specifying a branch target address 22 and region for storing the number of instructions to branch point 23. (see FIG. 2) No state and/or specified state name is disclosed or suggested.

Hasegawa's FIG. 5 illustrates a predictive branch instruction. No state and/or specified state name is disclosed or suggested.

Hasegawa's FIG. 10 illustrates a predictive branch instruction. No state and/or specified state name is disclosed or suggested.

The examiner points to Hasegawa's implicit opcode values/flags of Z and C. This is very different from applicant's quoted claim feature. Hasegawa hard codes opcodes referencing branch conditions in a region 21. Applicant tests if a state of a specified state name is a specified value and only then branches to an instruction at an address specified in the instruction. No state and/or specified state name is present in the cited reference. Accordingly, claims 1, 10, 16 and 19 are not anticipated by Hasegawa.

The examiner uses Dyer to reject claim 1 as having been anticipated.

Dyer's branch mark sequencer instruction format includes a branch type. Dyer's instruction format discloses no state and/or specified state name. Accordingly, claim 1 is not anticipated by Dyer.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or

Applicant : Gilbert Wolrich et al.
Serial No. : 10/070,035
Filed : July 3, 2002
Page : 7 of 7


Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-306US1 / P9627US

concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 30, 2003


Kenneth F. Kozik
Reg. No. 36,572

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906